

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1, 2, and 4-50 are pending. Claim 3 has been canceled. Claim 50 has been appended.

It is noted with appreciation that claims 43-47 are allowed, and that claims 22-42 and 48-49 are deemed allowable if rewritten in proper independent form.

As for claims 1-21:

Claims 1-3, 6-7, 9-13, and 16-18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kitchin (US 7,130,904) in view of Ho (US 7,151,762).

Claims 4, 5, and 19-21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kitchin, in view of Ho, and further in view of Meier (US 6,847,620).

Claims 14 and 15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kitchin, in view of Ho, and further in view of Cervello (US 2002/0071448 A1).

Claim 8 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kitchin, in view of Ho, and further in view of Beach (US 2003/0112820 A1).

Submission of IDSs

It is noted that IDS submissions fax filed on February 16, 2006, mailed April 11, 2006, and electronically filed July 17, 2006 have not been considered. The examiner is respectfully requested to consider the references cited among the foregoing IDS submissions.

It is noted that an IDS submission for an application identified as Atty. Dkt. No. 566.43394X00 was inadvertently attached to the instant Office action. This IDS was not filed by the Applicant or by any of its legal representatives, and appears to belong to another application that does not belong to Applicant. Suitable action is formally and respectfully requested to correct the file wrapper of the instant application to remove this unrelated IDS.

Interview with the Examiner Brooks and with Supervisory Examiner Corsaro

A telephonic interview was conducted between Examiner's Brooks and Corsaro and the inventor and the undersigned on April 3, 2007. We would like to thank the examiners for their time and attention in allowing us an opportunity to discuss the cited art and proposed

claim amendments. The examiners indicated that the proposed claim amendments appear to distinguish over the art as explained by the inventor, but that a closer examination of the art by Examiner Brooks would be required before a decision could be rendered.

Allowed Claims 43-47

Independent claims 43 and 44 have been amended to correct a minor informality in the preamble language. The undersigned believes that claims 43-47 remain in allowable condition.

Allowable claims 22-42 and 48-49

Allowable claims 22-42 and 48-49 are dependent claims from independent claim 7. While it is always appreciated that claims are deemed allowable by an examiner, the base claim 7 has been amended to more particularly claim the subject matter sought by applicant. Support for amended claim 7 is disclosed in the specification as originally filed at least in the Summary section and in the "public access point" discussion in the Detailed Description section. No new matter has been added. Reconsideration of claim 7 in light of the discussion below is respectfully requested.

Rejected Claims 1-21

Independent claims 1, 6, and 7 have been amended to more clearly set forth the distinctions over the cited art. As originally filed, independent claims 1, 6, and 7 claimed virtual Basic Service Sets (virtual BSS). As disclosed in the specification beginning on page 5, line 15, according to the present invention an end station can create a virtual bridged LAN referred to as a PVLAN, and in a particular embodiment of the PVLAN only standard elements of IEEE 802.11 are used. A LAN defined under 802.11 is referred to as a Basic Service Set (BSS). Consequently, a PVLAN of the present invention that is based on IEEE 802.11 is referred to in the present invention as a virtual BSS, which is the terminology used in the originally filed claims.

To more clearly set forth the virtual BSS feature of the present invention, the pending claims have been amended with additional limitations directed to the creation of a virtual BSS as being caused or initiated by any end station among end stations in the network.

For example, amended claim 1 substantively recites a security apparatus that includes a public access point (PAP) that is configured to allow any end station to cause the PAP to create a virtual BSS. An example of such a device is given on page 3, lines 9-24 of the specification, where a projector can cause a PAP to create a virtual BSS. Independent claim 6 has been similarly amended. Independent claim 7 has been similarly amended to recite a method for a secure wireless network. Amended claims 1, 6, and 7 do not introduce any new matter.

The Kitchen Reference

A review of Kitchen does not reveal the claimed “virtual BSS” as recited in the originally filed claims and as more clearly set forth in the currently amended claims. Kitchen discloses that a wireless access point may transmit multiple beacon signals, one for each of the wired communication networks accessible via the access point (col. 6, lines 48-52). Since Kitchen is silent as to creation of the BSS, those of ordinary skill would understand that not any end station can cause a BSS to be created, but that conventionally a network administrator causes creation of a BSS as needed to provide wireless access to those wired networks connected to the access point.

“Beaconing” is a function defined per 802.11 for the purpose of advertising a BSS from the access point and notifying wireless subscribers of any traffic that has been buffered for them at the access point while they were sleeping to conserve power. In the case of multiple BSSs, the respective beacons must be interleaved so that a wireless subscriber can detect the beacon signal being transmitted from its corresponding BSS. Kitchen describes the use of “constant” offsets from the Timing Synchronization Function (TSF) for defining Target Beacon Transmission Times (TBTTs) which establish the interleaving among the beacon signals (col. 6, lines 48 and following). Kitchen’s use of constant offsets to define the TBTTs suggests the reference does not teach BSS creation caused by any end station. The reason is because some end station may wish to belong to a new BSS having a TBTT already in use by an existing BSS at the access point. Since the TBTT associated with the existing BSS is constant in Kitchen, there is no way to accommodate the desired BSS since only one beacon signal can be transmitted at a time on a single channel.

The Ho Reference


A review of the Ho reference reveals that the reference is silent as to the notion of creating a BSS. Ho describes "virtual streams", which are QoS sessions managed within a single 802.11 BSS. Ho's reference to "virtual", therefore, has no relation to creating a BSS, or to end stations causing creation of a BSS.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicants believe all claims now pending in this Application are in condition for allowance. The issuance of a formal Notice of Allowance at an early date is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, please telephone the undersigned at 650-326-2400.

Respectfully submitted,


George B. F. Yee
Reg. No. 37,478

TOWNSEND and TOWNSEND and CREW LLP
Two Embarcadero Center, Eighth Floor
San Francisco, California 94111-3834
Tel: 650-326-2400
Fax: 415-576-0300
GBFY:cmm
60984422 v1